1 LUJAN AGUIGUI & PEREZ LLP 300 Pacific News Building 2 238 Archbishop Flores Street Hagåtña, Guam 96910 3 Telephone (671) 477-8064 Facsimile (671) 477-5297 4 **BENJAMIN B. CASSIDAY III** 5 5699 Kalanianaole Highway Honolulu HI 96821 6 Telephone (808) 220-3200 Facsimile (808) 373-7720 7 Attorneys for Plaintiffs 8 9 10 TERRITORY OF GUAM 11 CESS NAVARRO OLMO and RONNIE FERRERAS. 12 Plaintiffs, 13 v. 14 **PLAN** A. P. GREEN INDUSTRIES, INC., et al., 15 Defendants. 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 the meeting of November 28, 2005. 25 Efforts to have a preliminary discussion and a draft Scheduling Order in circulation at an 26 earlier date were complicated by the fact that the initial lead Counsel for the Plaintiffs, John C. 27 Unpingco, left the firm November 10, 2005, to open his own office and that his replacement lead 28

DISTRICT COURT OF GUAM NOV 2 9 2005 MARY L.M. MORAN CLERK OF COURT

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT OF GUAM

Civil Case 05-00025 ORIGINAL

LOCAL RULE 16.2(b) NOTICE OF

DISAGREEMENT ON SCHEDULING

Pursuant to Local Rule 16.2(b) of the District Court of Guam, Counsel for the parties have been unable to agree on a proposed Scheduling Plan. A plan proposed by Counsel for the Plaintiff was circulated to all local defense counsel November 25, 2005, and a meeting of Plaintiffs' Counsel and some but not all of the local counsel was held November 28, 2005. One local defense counsel was unable to attend because of her need to consult with off-island counsel and another local defense counsel submitted comments by email and participated by telephone in

counsel, Ignacio C. Aguigui, has been engaged on a daily basis in a complex civil trial in the District Court of the Northern Mariana Islands since October 21, 2005 and that is still on-going.

At the meeting of November 28, 2005, the local defense counsel in attendance and the attorney who submitted his suggestions by email and participated by phone requested that all dates contained in the proposed Scheduling Order be pushed back four to six months.

Counsel for the Plaintiffs has revised the proposed dates in an effort to accommodate defense counsel and is recirculating the proposed Scheduling Order to all local defense counsel. Counsel for the Plaintiffs and the Defendants seem generally in agreement that with the dates appropriately revised, a mutually acceptable Scheduling Order might be agreed upon on or before the scheduling hearing set for December 13, 2005.

The additional time that may be necessary to bring this case to trial is influenced by a variety of factors, including that the District Court is serviced by visiting Judges in the absence of an incumbent District Judge; the number of off island counsel involved; the number of Defendants; and the logistics inherent in the coordinating of the schedules of so many persons.

Attached hereto is a copy of the Plaintiffs' revised Proposed Scheduling Order and Discovery Plan and a separate draft Discovery Plan. Alternate Scheduling Proposals have not been received from defense counsel, but Counsel for the Plaintiffs do not infer from this that they have waived their objections to Plaintiffs' drafts.

Respectfully submitted this 29th day of November, 2005.

LUJAN, AGUIGUI & PEREZ LLP

By:

IGNACIO C. AGUIGUI, ESQ.

PMININ IN

1	Approved as to form and content:		
2 3	ARRIOLA COWAN & ARRIOLA		
5	By:ANITA P. ARRIOLA, ESQ.		
6 7	BLAIR STERLING & JOHNSON		
8	By:THOMAS C. STERLING, ESQ.		
9	CARLSMITH BALL LLP		
11 12	By:		
13 14	MAHER · YANZA · FLYNN · TIMBLIN LI	LP	
15 16	By:LOUIE J. YANZA, ESQ.		
17	DOOLEY ROBERTS & FOWLER LLP		
18 19	By: JON A. VISOSKY		
20	Declarat	ion of Service	
21 22	I certify that the foregoing pleading, entitled LOCAL RULE 16.2(b) NOTICE OF DISAGREEMENT ON SCHEDULING PLAN, was served November 29, 2005, upon the following:		
2324	ANITA P. ARRIOLA, ESQ. ARRIOLA COWAN & ARRIOLA		
2526	259 Martyr Street, Suite 201 Hagåtña, Guam 96910 Attorneys for Owens-Illinois, Inc.		
262728	THOMAS C. STERLING, ESQ. BLAIR STERLING & JOHNSON	2	
	Olmo and Ferreras v. A. P. Green et al. Civil Case 05-00025 IGAS R. II: OF. 2 WORD 25 Disa Positionent 98	3 Filed 11/29/2005	Page 3 of 14

1	1008 Pacific News Building
2	238 Archbishop Flores Street Hagåtña, Guam 96910
3	Attorneys for Metropolitan Life Insurance Company
4	J. PATRICK MASON, ESQ.
5	CARLSMITH BALL LLP 401 Bank of Hawaii Building
6	134 West Soledad Avenue Hagåtña, Guam 96910
7	Attorneys for Georgia-Pacific Corporation, A. W. Chesterton
8	Company, and Kaiser Gypsum Company, Inc.
9	LOUIE J. YANZA, ESQ. MAHER · YANZA · FLYNN · TIMBLIN LLP
10	115 Hesler Place
	Hagåtña, Guam 96910 Attorneys for John Crane, Inc.
11	
12	JON A. VISOSKY, ESQ. DOOLEY ROBERTS & FOWLER LLP
13	201 Orlean Pacific Plaza 865 South Marine Corps Drive
14	Tamuning, Guam 96913
15	Attorneys for Garlock, Inc., Viacom, Inc., Foster Wheeler Corporation, Bayer CropScience, Inc., and
16	The Dow Chemical Company
17	
18	PMM IV In
19	IGNACIO C. AGUIGUI, ESQ.
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	4
	'

Olmo and Ferreras v. A. P. Green et al. Civil Case 05-00025 Case di Off. 2 WORD 25 Disa Positionent 98

1 LUJAN AGUIGUI & PEREZ LLP 300 Pacific News Building 2 238 Archbishop Flores Street Hagåtña, Guam 96910 3 (671) 477-8064 Telephone Facsimile (671) 477-5297 4 DRAFT BENJAMIN B. CASSIDAY III 5 5699 Kalanianaole Highway Honolulu HI 96821 6 (808) 220-3200 Telephone Facsimile (808) 373-7720 7 Attorneys for Plaintiffs 8 9 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT OF GUAM 10 TERRITORY OF GUAM 11 **CESS NAVARRO OLMO and** Civil Case **05-00025 RONNIE FERRERAS.** 12 Plaintiffs, 13 [PROPOSED] SCHEDULING ORDER AND v. 14 **DISCOVERY PLAN** A. P. GREEN INDUSTRIES, INC., et al., 15 Defendants. 16 17 Pursuant to Rule 16 and 26(f) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Local Rule 16.1 18 for the District Court of Guam, the parties hereby submit the following proposed Scheduling 19 Order: 20 1. Nature of the Case: The Plaintiffs allege: They were employed by the United 21 States Navy approximately between the years 1966 to 1992. During their employment the 22 Plaintiffs worked aboard Navy vessels transiting between the Philippines and Guam and in Navy 23 shipyards in Hawaii and the Philippines. During their employment the Plaintiffs were regularly 24 and closely exposed to asbestos and asbestos-containing products that the Defendants 25 manufactured, sold and distributed for use on the vessels and in the shipyards were the Plaintiffs 26 were employed. As a result of their exposure to these ultra hazardous products, the Plaintiffs 27

28

unknowingly inhaled asbestos dust and asbestos fiber, as a result of which they each contracted

malignant mesothelioma, cancer, and/or other asbestos-related diseases, which illnesses were not diagnosed until about 2005. This is a products liability action alleging damages on the basis of (a) negligence; (b) strict liability; (c) warranty of merchantability; (d) market-share liability; (e) enterprise liability; (f) unfitness for intended use; and (g) negligent misrepresentation. The Plaintiffs also seek punitive damages.

2. The posture of the case is as follows:

- The following motions are on file: Certain of the Defendants have filed Motions to Dismiss for Lack of Personal Jurisdiction and for Improper Venue. No time or date has been set for the motions. Certain of the Defendants have filed a Notice of Tag-Along Action. The Plaintiffs have filed a Preliminary Opposition to Transfer of Case as Tag-Along Action. Counsel for Defendants Garlock, Inc., Viacom, Inc., Foster Wheeler Corporation, Bayer CropScience, Inc., and The Dow Chemical Company, and John Crane, Inc., have stated that they desire to have the case transferred to the MDL court, the Eastern District of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia: the Plaintiffs oppose such transfer because of the oppression or vexation that such a move would impose on the Plaintiffs, two elderly, frail and fatally ill men who are citizens of and reside in the Philippines. The distance from Manila to Philadelphia is 8,585 miles, whereas the distance from Manila to Hagåtňa, Guam, is 1,596. Given their health condition, it would be an intolerable burden on the Plaintiffs to be required to travel more than five times the distance to Guam to have their case heard in Philadelphia. Another adverse factor would be the difference in weather that they would likely experience if the case were moved to Philadelphia. Whereas Guam and Manila enjoy virtually identical climatic conditions, the East Coast of the United States is markedly different than the Philippines and Guam and such a change could also adversely affect the Plaintiffs' health. The Plaintiffs would also incur the additional hardship of the expense of a trip of such a distance. Philadelphia would be truly a forum non conveniens for the Plaintiffs.
- (b) The following motions have been resolved: None of the motions to dismiss have been resolved, as no date or time has been set for the motions. The parties request that the Court set a hearing date and time for the motions.

24

25

26

27

1		
2		NJAMIN B. CASSIDAY III, ESQ. 99 Kalanianaole Highway
3		nolulu, Hawaii 96821
	Fac	lephone: (808) 220-3200 esimile: (808) 373-7720
4	· [
5	For Defendants: AN	NITA P. ARRIOLA, ESQ.
6	AF	RRIOLA COWAN & ARRIOLA
7	<i>!</i> II	9 Martyr Street, Suite 201 gåtña, Guam 96910
8	Δt	torneys for Owens-Illinois, Inc.
	TOTAL	IOMAS C. STERLING, ESQ.
9		AIR STERLING & JOHNSON
10	10	08 Pacific News Building
11	I	8 Archbishop Flores Street
* 1	110	gåtña, Guam 96910 torneys for Metropolitan Life Insurance Company
12	2	torneys for Metropolitan Effe histirance Company
13	· II	PATRICK MASON, ESQ.
1.4	.	ARLSMITH BALL LLP
14	- I	1 Bank of Hawaii Building 4 West Soledad Avenue
15	₹	gåtña, Guam 96910
1.	Λ+	torneys for Georgia-Pacific Corporation, A. W.
16	9 II	esterton Company, and Kaiser Gypsum Company, Inc.
17		DUIE J. YANZA, ESQ.
18	.	AHER · YANZA · FLYNN · TIMBLIN LLP
10	11	5 Hesler Place
19	116	gåtña, Guam 96910
20	At	torneys for John Crane, Inc.
21		ON A. VISOSKY, ESQ.
22	<u> </u>	OOLEY ROBERTS & FOWLER LLP 1 Orlean Pacific Plaza
	86	5 South Marine Corps Drive
23	4 II	muning, Guam 96913
24	T N	torneys for Garlock, Inc., Viacom, Inc., Foster Wheeler
25	Co	orporation, Bayer CropScience, Inc., and The Downemical Company
26		
	19. The parties do not wish t	o submit this case to a settlement conference.
27	7	
28	3	_

5

1	20. The parties present the following suggestions for shortening trial: There is no real
2	suggestion for shortening the trial. Given that the District Court is serviced by visiting Judges in
3	the absence of an incumbent District Judge, the number of off island counsel, the number of
4	Defendants and the logistics of coordinating the schedules of so many persons, it is unlikely that
5	the case could be held within a shorter time than is proposed by this Scheduling Order.
6	21. The following issue will affect the status or management of the case:
7	
8	Dated:
9	
10	HONORABLE JOAQUIN V.E. MANIBUSAN JR.
11	MAGISTRATE JUDGE, DISTRICT COURT OF GUAM
12	Approved as to form and content:
13	LUJAN, AGUIGUI & PEREZ LLP
14	
15	By:
16	
17 18	ARRIOLA COWAN & ARRIOLA
19	D ₁₂ .
20	By:ANITA P. ARRIOLA, ESQ.
21	BLAIR STERLING & JOHNSON
22	
23	By:THOMAS C. STERLING, ESQ.
24	CARLSMITH BALL LLP
25	CARLSMIII DALL LLI
26	By:
27	J. I A I KICK WASON, ESQ.
28	6
	Olmo and Ferreras v. A. P. Green et al.

1	$\mathbf{MAHER} \cdot \mathbf{YANZA} \cdot \mathbf{FLYNN} \cdot \mathbf{TIMBLIN} \ \mathbf{LLP}$	
2		
3	By:LOUIE J. YANZA, ESQ.	_
4		
5	DOOLEY ROBERTS & FOWLER LLP	
6	By:	
7	By:JON A. VISOSKY	
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28	7	

1 2 3 4 5	LUJAN AGUIGUI & PEREZ LLP 300 Pacific News Building 238 Archbishop Flores Street Hagåtña, Guam 96910 Telephone (671) 477-8064 Facsimile (671) 477-5297 BENJAMIN B. CASSIDAY III 5699 Kalanianaole Highway Honolulu HI 96821	DRAFT	
6 7	Telephone (808) 220-3200 Facsimile (808) 373-7720		
8	Attorneys for Plaintiffs		
9	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT OF GUAM		
10	TERRITO	RY OF GUAM	
11 12	CESS NAVARRO OLMO and RONNIE FERRERAS,	Civil Case 05-00025	
13	Plaintiffs,		
14	v.	DISCOVERY PLAN	
15	A. P. GREEN INDUSTRIES, INC., et al.,		
16	Defendants.		
17	Pursuant to FRCP 26(f) and LR 16.1, the parties submit the following proposed discover		
18		hich the District Court is not opened, the task shall	
19		inen the District Court is not opened, the task sharr	
20	be completed the following business day.		
21	1. Status of Discovery:		
22	(a) The times for disclosures under Rule 26(a) and 26(e) of the Federal Rules of		
23	Civil Procedure are modified as follows: (1) The "initial disclosures" described in subsections (A) (B) (C) and		
24	(1) The "initial disclosures" described in subsections (A), (B), (C), and		
25	(D) of the FRCivP Rule 26(a)(1) shall be exchanged by Monday ,		
26	April 3, 2006 [Pursuant to local rules, these are not to be filed].		
27	· ·	of expert testimony by plaintiff's experts shall be	
20	made not later	than Monday, June 5, 2006. The disclosure of	

1		expert testimony by defendants' experts shall be made by Monday,	
2		July 10, 2006.	
3	(3)	The "pretrial disclosures" described in FRCivP Rule 26()(3)(A), (B)	
4		and (C) shall be made at least thirty (30) days before the trial date	
5		or by Tuesday, June 6, 2007.	
6	(b) The follo	wing is a description and schedule of all pretrial discovery each party	
7	intends to	intends to initiate prior to the close of discovery;	
8	Plaintiff:	Interrogatories, Requests to Produce, Admissions and Depositions;	
9	Defendants:	Interrogatories, Requests to Produce, Admissions and Depositions;	
10	2. Discovery Cut-Off Date: The discovery cut-off date (defined as the last day to		
11	file responses to discovery) is Tuesday, January 2, 2007.		
12	3. Discovery Motions Cut-Off Date: The anticipated discovery motions are		
13	Motions to Compel or Motions for Protective Orders. All discovery motions shall be filed on or		
14	before Monday, February 5, 2007, and heard on or about Monday, March 19, 2007 at 10 a.m.		
15	ARRIOLA COWAN & A	RRIOLA	
16			
17	By:ANITA P. ARRIO	LA, ESQ. Date	
18			
19	BLAIR STERLING & JO	HNSON	
20	By:		
21	THOMAS C. STE	RLING, ESQ. Date	
22	CARLSMITH BALL LLP		
23	CARLSWITH BALL ILP		
24	By:	NON ECO.	
25	J. PATRICK MAS	SON, ESQ. Date	
26			
27	MAHER · YANZA · FLY	NN · TIMBLIN LLP	
28		2	
	Olmo and Ferreras v. A. P. Green	n et al.	

Civil Case 05-00025
DiscoveryOPagov-00025 Document 98

1	D ₁₁₁	
2	By:	Date
3		
4	DOOLEY ROBERTS & FOWLER LLP	
5	Ву:	
6	JOHN A. VISOSKY	Date
7	LUJAN AGUIGUI & PEREZ LLP	
8	Den	
9	By: IGNACIO C. AGUIGUI, ESQ.	Date
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23 24		
24 25		
25 26		
2 0 27		
28		
۷۵	3	

Olmo and Ferreras v. A. P. Green et al. Civil Case 05-00025 Discrety@facv-00025 Document 98